the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) adopts the following Order:

After consideration of the application of the Kawasaki Motors Manufacturing Corporation, U.S.A. (KMM), operator of FTZ Subzone 59A, located at the KMM manufacturing facilities in Lincoln, Nebraska, filed with the Foreign-Trade Zones (FTZ) Board (the Board) on February 24, 1994, requesting authority to manufacture industrial robots under zone procedures within the subzone, the Board, finding that the requirements of the Foreign-Trade Zones Act, as amended, and the Board's regulations would be satisfied, and that the proposal would be in the public interest if approval were subject to certain restrictions, approves the application, subject to the following restrictions:

1. Authority is initially granted until July 1, 1999, subject to extension upon review.

2. The scope of authority is limited to the manufacture of industrial robots having six or more axes of motion.

Approval is subject to the FTZ Act and the FTZ Board's regulations, including § 400.28.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 2nd day of June 1995.

#### Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Import Administration, Alternate Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.

Attest:

#### John J. Da Ponte, Jr.,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–14211 Filed 6–8–95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

#### [Order No. 744; FTZ Docket 4-94]

# Approval for Manufacturing Authority (Utility Work Trucks), Within Foreign-Trade Subzone 59A; Kawasaki Motors Manufacturing Corporation, U.S.A., Lincoln, Nebraska

Pursuant to its authority under the Foreign-Trade Zones Act of June 18, 1934, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a-81u), the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) adopts the following Order:

After consideration of the application of the Kawasaki Motors Manufacturing Corporation, U.S.A. (KMM), operator of FTZ Subzone 59A, located at the KMM manufacturing facilities in Lincoln, Nebraska, filed with the Foreign-Trade Zones (FTZ) Board (the Board) on January 10, 1994, requesting authority to manufacture utility work trucks under zone procedures within the subzone, the Board, finding that the requirements of the Foreign-Trade Zones Act, as amended, and the Board's regulations would be satisfied, and that the

proposal would be in the public interest if initial approval is for a limited time period, approves the application for a period ending July 1, 1999, subject to extension upon review.

Approval is subject to the FTZ Act and the FTZ Board's regulations, including § 400.28.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 2nd day of June 1995.

#### Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Import Administration, Alternate Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.

Attest

#### John J. Da Ponte, Jr.,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–14210 Filed 6–8–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

## International Trade Administration [A-588-703]

#### Internal Combustion Forklift Trucks From Japan; Amendment to Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce. ACTION: Notice of Amendment to Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: On March 1, 1994, and June 23, 1994, the United States Court of International Trade (CIT) affirmed the final results of redetermination issued by the Department of Commerce (the Department) pursuant to three remands of the final results of the first review of the antidumping duty order on internal combustion industrial forklift trucks from Japan (57 FR 3167, January 28, 1992). These remands pertained to three manufacturers/exporters of forklift trucks from Japan. The period of review was November 25, 1987, through May 31, 1989. The CIT's opinions have not been appealed. Therefore, we are amending the final results of this review.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** June 9, 1995.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Davina Friedmann or Michael Rill, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC, 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4733.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### **Background**

On January 28, 1992, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the

final results of the first administrative review of the antidumping duty order on forklift trucks from Japan (57 FR 3167; January 28, 1992). The review covered four manufacturers/exporters of forklift trucks. The period of review was November 25, 1987, through May 31, 1989. In February 1992, interested parties initiated actions in the CIT contesting the final results of this review.

On July 23, 1993, the CIT, in Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc. and Toyo Umpanki Company, Ltd. v. United States, remanded the final results to the Department. The CIT instructed the Department to (1) reconsider whether it properly allocated Toyota Motor Corporation's (Toyota) U.S. brokerage and handling, inland freight, and warranty expenses to the forklifts subject to the administrative review; (2) reconsider whether it properly recategorized Toyota's home market direct warranty expenses; (3) correct the treatment of the circumstance-of-sale (COS) adjustment for certain direct selling expenses of Toyo Umpanki, Ltd. (TCM); and (4) correct the treatment of TCM's credit income in the calculation of U.S. price (USP).

The Department submitted its final results of redetermination pursuant to court remand on September 17, 1993. In the final results of redetermination, the Department reallocated Toyota's U.S. brokerage and handling, inland freight, and warranty expenses over Toyota's total industrial truck sales for exporter's sales price (ESP) sales, as opposed to allocating these expenses only over Toyota's sales of subject merchandise. The Department also corrected arithmetic errors in the treatment of Toyota's home market warranty expenses in both the purchase price and ESP analyses for two categories of forklift trucks.

The Department changed TCM's ESP analysis so that the direct selling expenses which were included in constructed value (CV) were subtracted from foreign market value (FMV). As ordered by the CIT, the Department also corrected TCM's purchase price analysis by adding U.S. credit income to USP instead of to FMV. As a result of these changes, the dumping margins changed from 12.22% to 12.02% for Toyota, and changed from 7.71% to 6.17% for TCM. The CIT affirmed these results and dismissed the case on March 1, 1994.

The CIT, in *Hyster Co., et al. v. United States*, issued a second remand on August 6, 1993. This remand pertained only to Toyota. The Department submitted its final results of redetermination on October 4, 1993. In accordance with the CIT's instructions,

the Department corrected its treatment of selling expenses, recategorizing certain U.S. advertising expenses from indirect to direct selling expenses. This recategorization affected ESP sales only. Despite this change, Toyota's dumping margin remained at 12.02%.

On March 1, 1994, the CIT, in NACCO Materials Handling Group, Inc. v. United States (formerly known as Hyster Co., et al. v. United States), issued another order remanding the final results to the Department to (1) reconsider the treatment of the commodity tax in Japan for Toyota, TCM, and Nissan Motor Company (Nissan); (2) redetermine whether Nissan's and Toyota's related-party sales were at arm's-length prices; and (3) correct certain errors in TCM's database.

The Department changed its methodology for commodity tax adjustments by eliminating the COS adjustment for differences in taxes. The Department added to USP the result of multiplying the foreign market tax rate by the price of the U.S. merchandise at the same point in the chain of commerce that the foreign market tax was applied to foreign market sales. The Department also adjusted the tax amount calculated for USP and the amount of tax included in FMV. We deducted the portions of the foreign market tax and the U.S. tax adjustment that are the result of expenses that are included in the foreign market price used to calculate the foreign market tax and in the USP used to calculate the USP tax, but later deducted to calculate FMV and USP.

The CIT ordered the Department to point to substantial evidence on the record in support of its determination that Nissan and Toyota's related-party transfer prices were negotiated at arm's length, and, if unable to do so, to make any necessary adjustments. The Department was not able to find evidence on the record to support its original determination that Nissan's and Toyota's reported transfer prices were at arm's length. Therefore, the Department adjusted Nissan's material costs in the calculation of home market cost of production, CV, and further manufacturing in the United States. The Department also adjusted for Toyota's material costs by disallowing Toyota's claimed discount from the dealer price list and using the related supplier's prices to unrelated dealers in calculating the cost of inputs in the computation of Toyota's United States further manufacturing costs.

As directed by the CIT, the Department also corrected certain errors in TCM's database. The Department corrected errors regarding (1) reported

fees paid to trading companies, (2) U.S. brokerage and handling, (3) containerization costs, (4) ocean freight, (5) marine insurance, (6) U.S. duty, (7) U.S. freight to warehouse, (8) credit, and (9) warranty.

The CIT affirmed these results and dismissed the case on June 23, 1994.

#### **Amended Final Results of Review**

As a result of the revisions made pursuant to these remands, we determine that the following weightedaverage dumping margins exist for the period November 25, 1987, through May 31. 1989:

Manufacturer/Exporter	Margin (per- cent)
Nissan	7.39% 6.74% 13.75%

Because the CIT's decision has not been appealed, the Department will order the immediate lifting of the suspension of liquidation of, and instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on, entries subject to these reviews, as appropriate. Individual differences between FMV and USP may vary from the percentages stated above. The Department will issue appraisement instructions concerning these entries directly to the Customs Service.

This notice is published in accordance with section 751(a) (1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(a) (1)), and 19 CFR 353.22(c) (8).

Dated: June 2, 1995.

#### Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-14212 Filed 6-8-95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

#### **Determination Not to Revoke Countervailing Duty Orders**

**AGENCY:** Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of determination not to revoke countervailing duty orders.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (the Department) is notifying the public of its determination not to revoke the countervailing duty orders listed below. EFFECTIVE DATE: June 9, 1995.

### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Brian Albright or Maria MacKay, Office of Countervailing Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of

Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202)482-2786.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### **Background**

On March 1, 1995, the Department published in the Federal Register (60 FR 11075) its intent to revoke the countervailing duty orders listed below. Under 19 CFR 355.25(d)(4)(iii), the Secretary of Commerce will conclude that an order is no longer of interest to interested parties and will revoke the order if no domestic interested party (as defined in sections 355.2(i)(3), (i)(4), (i)(5), and (i)(6) of the regulations) objects to revocation and no interested party requests an administrative review by the last day of the 5th anniversary month.

Within the specified time frame, we received an objection from a domestic interested party to our intent to revoke these countervailing duty orders. Therefore, because the requirements of 19 CFR 355.25(d)(4)(iii) have not been met, we will not revoke these orders.

This determination is in accordance with 19 CFR 355.25(d)(4).

#### COUNTERVAILING DUTY ORDERS

Chile: Standard Carnations (C-337-601).	03/19/87, 52 FR 8635.
Iran:	
Raw Pistachios (C–507–501).	03/11/86, 51 FR 8344.
Israel:	
Oil Country Tubular Goods. (C-508-601).	03/06/87, 52 FR 6999.
New Zealand:	
Carbon Steel Wire Rod. (C-614-504).	03/07/86, 51 FR 7971.
Turkey:	
Welded Carbon Steel Pipes and Tubes. (C-489-502).	03/07/86, 51 FR 7984.
Turkey:	
Welded Carbon Steel Line Pipe. (C-489-502).	03/07/86, 51 FR 7984.
France:	00/00/07
Brass Sheet and Strip (C-427-603).	03/06/87, 52 FR 6996.

Dated: May 25, 1995.

#### Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance. [FR Doc. 95-14213 Filed 6-8-95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P